

gospels in a form equally orthodox and attractive, and without the fragmentary look of chapters and verses. His aim was to present the gospels in popular form, such as Frenchmen demand in other books. And his success was brilliant. He produced what he designed. It commanded the approval of the archbishop of Paris, and thus became a book which, by your canon law, Christians may read—of course, under the eye and direction of a confessor. Its history is very remarkable. It obtained the sanction of many other bishops and archbishops. It secured the approbation of the venerable Leo himself, who sent him "from the bottom of his heart his apostolic benediction." What is more, the pope approved even of the preface, which laments the long suppression of the Scriptures among Roman Catholics. Finally, Leo attests his "earnest desire that the objects of Lasarre's efforts, as indicated in said preface, may be fully achieved." The work met with unparalleled success. More than twenty editions appeared in a few months. During the first year twenty-five editions had been sold.

On December 4, 1886, the work of Lasarre was approved by the pope himself, and began to be circulated, as aforesaid. And on December 20, in the year following, the same book was condemned, suppressed, and forbidden by the same good and venerable Pope Leo XIII, who is no more his own master than you are. "Infallible," though he is styled, he was overruled, humiliated, and forced to swallow down his own words, and to make himself a pillar of remembrance as to the utter nothingness of the "White Pope," in the modern Roman sect. The Jesuits have revolutionized not only the doctrine and testimony of the fathers; they have created not only a new sect, but another papacy. Leo is supreme only when seated on the Jesuit tripod, and letting the "Black Pope" speak oracles through his lips.

In the midst of all this unlooked for hunger and thirst for "the words that are spirit and are life"—only a year and a few days after the papal license had been granted—what's this? "The Holy Gospels, a new translation by Henri Lasarre, Paris, 1887," is forbidden by the same authority and put into the index of prohibited books.

"Having been referred to our most holy lord, Pope Leo XIII" (so runs the proclamation of suppression), "his holiness approved the decree, and ordered it to be issued." Give it to us, then; and hear it, American Christians, as follows: "And let no one, of whatsoever rank and condition, dare in any place or in any tongue, to publish in future, or if published, to read or to retain, the aforementioned condemned and proscribed works; but let him be held bound to deliver them to the local ordinaries, or to the inquisitors of heretical iniquity, under the penalties proclaimed in the Index of Forbidden Books."

Pope Leo XIII, for a whole year, has officially approved, blessed, set forth and encouraged "heretical iniquity."

Considering the fact that on Tuesday, July 18, 1870, Pope Pius IX promulgated the decree of infallibility for all popes, which decree all loyal Catholics are bound to accept as a cardinal doctrine of their faith, we cannot help wondering what it is that conscientious Catholics do when a pope so flatly reverses himself, as in the above instance. According to the decree of 1870 Leo's approval of Lasarre's translation of the gospels was "irreformable."

It may interest my readers to know that of

the two (and only two) negative votes publicly given on that fateful July 18th, one was cast by Bishop Fitzgerald, of Little Rock, Kansas. Another American prelate, Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, prepared and later published a speech against infallibility, which he had no opportunity of delivering. Here is a brief quotation from it: "Over and over again, the Catholics had denied, under their solemn oath, that this power belonged to the pope of Rome within the realm of England. If they had not done this, they never would have been, and never ought to have been, admitted to the privilege of civil liberty. How is it possible for the faith thus pledged to the British government to be reconciled with the definition of papal infallibility? It is a knot which I cannot untie. *Davus sum, non Oedipus.*" Lexington, Va.

#### A COUNTRY CHURCH-YARD.

There's a quiet country church-yard,  
Where the pine trees whisper low,  
And the ashes of the many dead  
Lie deep beneath the snow.

What peaceful rest! They've long forgot  
The sorrows of this life,  
Each sleeping in his narrow cell,  
Forever out of sight.

Somewhere in that church-yard, friend,  
Will be a quiet bed  
Where we will take our last long sleep  
Along with the ranks of the dead.

Oh! may we live that, when that hour  
Comes quietly gliding through,  
We'll pass away with sweetest dreams  
Of rest we never knew.

#### CHRISTIANITY AND WAR.

By Rev. E. C. Gordon, D. D.

A booklet, entitled "The Last Weapon," has been sent to me by the publishers at the request of a friend. In a communication which accompanies the booklet the friend asks these questions: "Has not the time come now for our Christian America as a nation to demonstrate an irresistible manifestation of love to all the warring peoples in some heroic way that will reach the heart of all humanity? Would not a great federal appropriation to help to restore the shattered nations of Europe as soon as the war is stopped, not only overwhelm the peoples with a new world weapon—kindness—but be in itself the best preparedness for our own future safety from attack, as well as lay the foundation for a new relationship of the nations formed out of the present chaos?"

This booklet and these questions force upon every intelligent Christian who reads them the question of duty with respect to war. For myself I can answer the second question in this way: As a citizen of the United States I would gladly vote for and pay my share of a contribution of seven billions of dollars to the warring nations, if the ends contemplated by the author of the booklet and my friend could be accomplished. Admitting the right of a majority of our people to authorize such a contribution, and setting aside all Christian considerations, the United States could very well afford to make it. It is probable that we shall have to spend more than that huge sum in order to contribute in any effective way in bringing the war to an end, and to rehabilitate ourselves and the other warring nations. The real objection to any such contribution is to be found in the closing words of the booklet which its author places in the mouth of our ascended and glorified Lord, in response to the question: "'O Christ-God! Canst Thou not save, even now?' 'I have offered them My

Last Weapon for more than nineteen hundred years. If they still refuse it, I have no other!' said the Christ-God, as he drew the suffering Child to His breast."

In the author's view Christ's Last Weapon is Love: love of enemies, which resists not evil, even the most dreadful and wicked which the devil can devise and human energy can inflict. Our Lord admits that for centuries he has offered this weapon and men refuse to use it. We may well ask, what hope there is for a devil-ruled world, if Christ has exhausted his resources? The answer is that love, as understood by our author and those who are gratuitously circulating her book, is not our Lord's last weapon. They have misunderstood his attitude towards war and the attitude in which he places civil government with respect to war. Our Lord's last weapon with respect to war and those who wickedly use it, as well as with respect to other sinners who reject his love and mercy, is set forth by himself in such passages as Matt. 13:41, 42, 49, 50; 25:30, 41, with which may be compared Rev. 19:1-3, 11-21; 20:7-15.

The real question concerns the duty of Christ's redeemed, regenerated and sanctified people with respect to the civil government of which they are citizens? In seeking a Biblical answer to this question several important things are to be borne in mind. One is that except from the days of Moses to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, there has never been on earth a God-appointed Church-State; and, certainly since the advent of Christ on earth, there has been no Christian civil government, except in the very broad sense that some civil governments have had as citizens some who professed to be Christians.

Another truth to be borne in mind is that the object of the present Christian dispensation is not to convert the world of humanity to Christ by present gospel agencies; not to abolish war and other evils; but to gather out of the mass of humanity the saints of God and to perfect them for service in a heavenly kingdom ultimately to be established on earth, or rather in the new heavens and the new earth wherein righteousness will dwell. The reader is referred again to the parable of the wheat and the tares, and to Eph. 14:11-13, and similar passages.

The law of love is a law given directly and expressly to saints. Christ never expected unregenerated people to obey it. He does expect his own people to obey it under all circumstances. At the same time he requires and expects them to obey the laws of the civil governments under which they live when these laws do not contravene the laws of God. There is no law of God which forbids civil government to wage defensive war against those at home or abroad who seek to murder its citizens, to destroy unjustly their property, and to deprive them of their God-given rights. On the contrary, there is divine authority for a civil government to wage such a war, and for Christian citizens to sustain their government in bringing it to a successful conclusion. The Sixth Commandment is to be interpreted in the light of a primeval divine law: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." Gen. 9:6. This law is repeated over and over again in the Old Testament as a rule of civil government. It is expressly re-enacted in the New Testament. See Rom. 13:1-7, where also God's people are commanded to support their civil government when it becomes "the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye (Chris-